

### Remarks

In view of the following discussion, the applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are anticipated under the provisions of 35 U. S. C § 102, or 35 U. S. C § 103. Thus, the applicants believe that all of these claims are in allowable form.

### RESTRICTION

During a telephone conversation with the Examiner on March 25, 2009, applicants elected to prosecute claims 1-13 and 16-17. In this paper, applicants affirm this election.

### OBJECTIONS

#### A. Abstract

The Examiner indicates that the Abstract uses improper language. Applicants have amended the abstract to remove improper language. In view of the amendments to the Abstract, the basis for the Examiner's objection thereto has been removed. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiners' objection to the Abstract be withdrawn.

#### B. Drawings

The Examiner objects to the drawings because they include reference characters not included in the description. Applicants have amended the drawings to remove reference characteristics not included in the description. In view of these amendments to the drawings, the basis for the Examiner's

objection thereto has been removed. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiners' objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

C. Claims

Claim 16 is objected to for informalities. In particular, the Examiner indicates that the term "wherein it" should be changed to "which". Applicant have amended claim 16 to replace the phrase "wherein it comprises" with the term "comprising". In view of this amendment to claim 16, the basis for the Examiner's objection thereto has been removed. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiners' objection to claim 16 be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS

A. 35 U. S. C. § 102

1. Claims 16-17 are not anticipated by Suzuki et al.

Claims 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U. S. C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Suzuki et al. (European Patent 1 203 977 published May 8, 2002). The applicants submit that claims 16-17 are not anticipated by this reference.

Claims 1, 6-8 and 10-11 were also rejected under 35 U. S. C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Suzuki et al. In view of the cancellation of claims 1, 6-8 and 10-11 this rejection is moot.

With regard to claim 16, Suzuki et al. discloses, in FIG. 25, a projection system, comprising:

- illumination means that generate an illumination beam (see Suzuki et al. at paragraph [0252]: illumination light source system comprising a luminous element 11, a parabolic reflector 12 and a condenser lens 13);

- an imager (Suzuki et al. ref. 14 : see paragraph [0253]: "The micro-mirror device 14 spatially intensity-modulates the light gathered by the condenser lens 13 and reflects intensity-modulated light as an optical image signal containing image information.);

- a projection module intended to project the image on a screen (ref.18) defining a specified projection plane, said module comprising:

- an objective (ref. 58) for refracting said imaging beam, having a refractive portion comprising lenses (see paragraph [0353]); and

- a curved mirror (ref. 60) for deflecting the imaging beam,

- at least two deflection surfaces (ref. 59, 22) for deflecting the imaging beam emanating from the objective,

wherein the curved mirror is a aspheric mirror (see paragraph [0353] : "ref. 60 denotes a convex mirror ... which is the same convex mirror as those described in the preceding embodiments" showing aspheric mirrors) having an assymmetric shape defining an optical axis (ref. 61 denoting the optical axis of the convex mirror 60 : see paragraph [0353]).

Contrary to what is stated by the Examiner, in Suzuki et al., the two deflection surfaces (ref. 59, 22) are NOT placed in the path of the imaging beam between the objective (ref. 58) and the curved mirror (ref. 60), but ONLY one (ref. 59) of these deflection surfaces.

Moreover, Suzuki et al. does not disclose the optical axis (ref.61) of the curved mirror (ref. 60) coinciding with the optical axis of the objective.

Consequently, claim 16 is patentable over Suzuki et al.

Claim 17 depends directly from claim 16. For the same reasons as stated above for claim 16, claim 17 is also patentable over Suzuki et al.

## B. 35 U. S. C. § 103

2. Claims 2 and 12-13 are not unpatentable over Suzuki et al. in view of Bassi et al.

Claims 2 (now claim 16) and 12-13 stand rejected under 35 U. S. C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. (European Patent 1 203 977 published May 8, 2002) in view of Bassi et al. (U. S. Patent Publication 2003/0231261 published December 2003). The applicants submit that claim 2 (now claim 16) is not rendered obvious by the combination of these references.

Claims 12-13 were also rejected under 35 U. S. C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. (European Patent 1 203 977 published May 8, 2002) in view of Bassi et al. (U. S. Patent Publication 2003/0231261 published December 2003). In view of the cancellation of claims 12-13 this rejection is moot.

Claim 16 recites that the curved mirror is optionally a hyperbolic mirror which is placed on the exit side of the objective in such a way that the axis of the hyperbola passing through the foci of the hyperbola coincides with the optical axis the objective.

Bassi et al. discloses indeed, in Fig. 11, a projection system with a curved mirror for deflecting the imaging beam coming from an objective, wherein the curved mirror (ref. 121, 123) is a hyperbolic mirror which is placed on the exit side of the objective. But Bassi et al. fails to disclose that the axis of the hyperbola passing through the foci of the hyperbola coincides with the optical axis the objective.

Consequently, as claim 16 is not described in Suzuki et al. or in Bassi et al., claim 16 is patentable over Suzuki et al. in view of Bassi et al..

## 3. Claims 3-5 and 9

In view of the cancellation of claims 3-5 and 9 the rejections thereof are moot.

CONCLUSION

Thus, the applicants submit that none of the claims, presently in the application are anticipated under the provisions of 35 U. S. C. § 102, or 35 U. S. C § 102. Consequently, the applicants believe that all of the claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Ms. Patricia A. Verlangieri, at (609) 734-6867, so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,



Patricia A. Verlangieri, Attorney  
Reg. No. 42,201  
(609) 734-6867

Patent Operations  
Thomson Inc.  
P. O. Box 5312  
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312

September 30, 2009